



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,960	02/20/2004	Thomas A. Petersen	1778.3290002 (0187.02US)	4828
56074 7590 01/28/2009 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
PORTKA, GARY J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2188				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/783,960

Applicant(s)

PETERSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Gary J. Portka

Art Unit

2188

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gary J. Portka (PTO).

(3) _____.

(2) Steven Oppenheimer (App's rep., Reg. No. 57,418).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 43-58, 70-72, 74-77, 81-89, 92 and 93.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative stated that the 35 USC 101 and 102 rejections by amendment and/or claim cancelation. They questioned the 35 USC 112 rejection and suggested possible amendment to overcome. Examiner stated that the proposed amendment was questionable because it suggested simply removing claim limitations, and that upon further review of the disclosure that the limitation of coherence being independent of latency appeared to be clear.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Gary J Portka/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2188